



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,888	04/05/2004	Sae-rin Kim	Q79990	4029
23373 7590 06/04/2009 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
ENG, DAVID Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2455				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,888

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID Y. ENG

Art Unit

2455

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Newly submitted claims 17-24 have been entered. The active claims are 1-24 of which claims 1, 7, 9, 13 and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori (USP 7,009,942) in view of Fellman (USP 6,980,990).

See Figures 8 and 12 and the corresponding description in Fujimori. Fujimori teaches:

Claim 1, 9, 13, 14, 15,

A method (flow charts in Figures 8 and 12) of automatically determining a device's nickname the method (column 1, line 9-12), comprising:

recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network (see "detecting means" in column 2 line 9-10) without being assigned any nickname, wherein the nickname identifies a characteristic of the first device and can be recognized by the network;

selecting a nickname (column 8, line 27-33) for the recognized first device from a recommended nickname table which is also connected to the network; and

registering information (inherent, see "memory stores connection information" in claim 1) regarding the selected nickname in a nickname registration- managing module connected to the network.

The only difference is that Fujimori does not explicitly state that the names are from a table. Assigning names from a name table is well known in network or communication art.

See at least the title and the abstract in Fellman. Fellman teaches a name assigning system for assigning and registering names to devices connected to Internet. From the teaching of Fellman, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to assign names from a table to devices connected to a network so that the user is able to make names he like available to the name selection system of Fujimori.

Claim 2, 10

This is nothing more than an interlock signal indicating to the name assigning system that a device is newly connected to the network and requires a name assignment. The signal is inherent.

Claim 3, 4, 11, 12

See steps SA5 in Figure 8 and step SB4 in Figure 12. The newly connected device is detected by a monitoring device.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 16

Inherent. That is exactly why newly connected device requires name assignment so as to be uniquely identified in a network.

Claims 17,

The claims merely consist of non-functional descriptive materials which have no functional relationship to the method steps of their parent claims. The claims therefore are not patentably distinct over the applied references.

Claim 18,

See IP address in column 1/line 23-29, 40, 50 and 55 in Fellman.

Claim 19,

See DNS in column 1/line 17, 23, 33, 41 of Fellman.

Claims 20-24

In column 8/line 27-33, Fujimori teaches that "(i)n a line name column, the line name specific to each apparatus is displayed which was automatically assigned when the apparatus was connected to the mLAN system". The module in Fujimori which triggers the assigning performs the requesting of the determination of the nickname of the first device.

Response

On page 10 of the response, Applicants state "the claimed method, thus, sets forth, *inter alia*, recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname". Fujimori teaches in column 8/line 27-33 that "(i)n a line

name column, the line name specific to each apparatus is displayed which was automatically assigned when the apparatus was connected to the mLAN system". The apparatus in Fujimori is without a name when it is connected to the LAN network. The system in Fujimori automatically recognizes the apparatus when it is connected to the network. Thereafter, a name is assigned.

On page 11, applicants contended that Fujikori's apparatus has another name other than the assigned line name. Whether or not Fujimori's apparatus has another name would not render Applicants' claims patentably distinct over Fujimori so long a name is automatically assigned to an apparatus in Fujimori when the apparatus is connected to a network column 8/line 27-33).

On page 12, Applicants appear to contend that the claims recite assigning a nickname which identifies a characteristic of the device. The claims recite automatically assigning a nickname to a device when it is connected to a network. The claims do not recite how the nickname is used differently than the line name of Fujimori. Assigning a nickname is no different than assigning a line name. Merely reciting that the nickname identifies a characteristic of the device would not render the claims patentably distinct over Fujimori because whether or not a nickname identifies a characteristic of the device is solely dependent on the chosen name and is not related to assigning a name per se.

Fujimori and Fellman meet all claim limitations. There are no arguments provided by Appellants as to how the claims or Applicants' improvement are patentably distinct over the applied references or what problem is solved by the improvement.

Other References Cited

Figure 1 of Alexander et al (USP 6,798,767) show a naming menu having nickname. Alexander also teach, in column 9/line 5-14, associating device names with IP address in a table.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID Y. ENG whose telephone number is 571-272-3984. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8AM to 3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SALEH NAJJAR, can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DAVID Y. ENG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455